UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,350	07/14/2005	Kari Sundman	991.1203 3051	
21831 7590 12/27/2007 WOLF BLOCK SCHORR AND SOLIS-COHEN LLP 250 PARK AVENUE			EXAMINER	
			FORTUNA, JOSE A	
NEW YORK,	NY 10177		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1791	
				
•			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/27/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO@WOLFBLOCK.COM

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/519,350	SUNDMAN ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		José A. Fortuna	1791				
Danie d f	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period fo	• •	410 057 TO EVENE - MONTH	(O) OD THIDTY (OO) DAYO				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATES OF THE MAILING D	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 O	<u>ctober 2007</u> .					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	i3 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)🖂	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 7-10</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
·	Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 7-10</u> is/are rejected.						
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.	•				
Applicat	ion Papers		•				
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	raminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority 1	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
	 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachmer	• •	_					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) 🔲 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date		ratent Application (PTO-152)				
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, 					

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/519,350

Art Unit: 1791

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-5 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a). This rejection is set forth in the prior Office action mailed on June 07, 2007.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on October 07, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that a) recovering the product from the first zone in the primary reference, Brink, would stifle Brink's purpose since it would lead to the formation of pollutants in the combustion of the organic materials. Applicants also argue b) that there are two gas streams in the claimed process, while the primary reference includes only one gas stream. The arguments are not convincing for the following reasons:

With regard to a), one of ordinary skill in the art would certainly realize that recovering the gases at that junction does not necessarily create pollution, especially if the temperature is maintained within the levels taught by the primary reference. Note that Brink teaches that to preclude the recombination of the

Application/Control Number: 10/519,350

Art Unit: 1791

intermediate products the temperature needs to be within certain levels and maintained, see abstract. Moreover, the secondary reference teaches the recovery of the gases after the pyrolysis which does not include the release of obnoxious gases into the atmosphere and actually recovers a gas that is a valuable byproduct, dimethyl disulfide. Therefore, the recovering of the gases at that junction would not go against the teaching's of the primary reference. It has been held that "[R]eferences are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures." In re Bozek, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA) 1969. In this case one of ordinary skill in the art would certainly realize the advantages of recovering the gases after the pyrolysis. It has been held that "[K]nown work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces/market place incentives if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art." It has also been held that it is obvious to try, choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions with a reasonable expectation of success. See recent Board decision Ex parte Smith, --USPQ2d--, slip op. at 20, (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. June 25, 2007) (Citing KSR, 82 USPQ2d at 1396).

• With regard to b), the combination of the references would have two gas streams, the ones in which the gases are recovered and then the stream in which the coke is recovered, i.e. the sodium sulphide which would be converted to hydrogen sulfide in the absorber Application/Control Number: 10/519,350

Art Unit: 1791

Conclusion

4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José A. Fortuna whose telephone number is 571-272-1188. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P. Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/519,350 Page 5

Art Unit: 1791

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/José A Fortuna/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1791

JAF